1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 8 CARPENTERS HEALTH & SECURITY 9 TRUST OF WESTERN WASHINGTON. et al... Case No. C12-1223RSL 10 Plaintiffs, 11 v. ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF IRVING DIEDRICH CONSTRUCTION, INC., **DEFAULT JUDGMENT** 12 13 Defendants. 14 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiffs' "Motion for Default Judgment." 15 16 Dkt. # 16. Having reviewed the motion and the supporting materials, the Court finds as follows: 17 The default entered in the above-captioned matter on September 26, 2012, 18 established the well-pleaded allegations of the complaint pertaining to liability. Judgment in 19 favor of plaintiffs and against defendant is therefore appropriate. It is hereby **ORDERED** that default judgment is entered against Irving Diedrich Construction, Inc., for the period September 20 21 through November 2011, for unpaid contributions of \$13,132.50, liquidated damages of 22 \$1,334.16 and interest of \$2,912.49. Plaintiffs' requests for attorney's fees and costs are unreasonably high, however, for a case in which defendant did not appear, counsel had a limited 23

role in the audit and investigative processes, efforts to obtain entry of default and discovery were

unsuccessful, and plaintiff was ordered to show cause why the matter should not be dismissed

ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT

24

25

26

for failure to prosecute. Attorney's fees of \$2,140.00 and costs of \$400.00 shall be awarded.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the judgment shall accrue interest on the total unpaid balance of \$19,919.15 at the rate of 0.11 percent (0.11%) per annum¹ from the date of judgment until fully paid.

For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion for default judgment (Dkt. # 16) is GRANTED. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of plaintiffs and against defendant as described above. The Order to Show Cause issued on January 7, 2014 (Dkt. # 14) is hereby VACATED.

Dated this 3rd day of February, 2014.

MMS (asuik Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge

¹ This percentage rate was specifically set forth by plaintiffs in their proposed order. No other post-judgment interest rate was discussed in the moving papers.